

1 Counsel listed on Signature Page  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

12 IN RE LIDODERM ANTITRUST  
13 LITIGATION

15 This Document Relates to ALL CASES

16 No. C-14-md-02521 WHO

**JOINT TELEPHONIC STATUS  
CONFERENCE STATEMENT**

Date: August 8, 2017  
Time: 3:30 p.m.  
Location: Courtroom 2, 17<sup>th</sup> floor, by telephone  
The Hon. William H. Orrick

1 Pursuant to the Court's Stipulated Scheduling Order dated January 15, 2015 [ECF 134] and  
 2 further docket entry dated May 2, 2017 [ECF 734], the parties hereby submit this Joint  
 3 Telephonic Status Conference Statement for the Telephonic Case Management Conference on  
 4 August 8, 2017, at 3:30 p.m. The parties will be prepared to discuss the following items.

5 **I. CALL INFORMATION**

6 Dial-in Number: **855-749-4750**

7 Access Code: **921-019-942#**

8 **II. PENDING MATTERS**

9 **1. End-Payor Class Counsel's Motion for Entry of A Set-Aside Order.**

10 On June 2, 2017, End-Payor Plaintiffs filed a Motion for Entry of a Set-Aside Order. ECF  
 11 742. Defendants timely filed their opposition on July 7, 2017, and End-Payor Plaintiffs filed their  
 12 reply July 19, 2017. The motion is set for hearing at the Status Conference.

13 **2. Page limits for motions *in limine*.**

14 The Court's pretrial order (PTO) [ECF #645] provides that motions in limine must be filed  
 15 at least 21 days before the pretrial conference, which in this case sets an October 16, 2017 filing  
 16 deadline, with the parties to exchange draft motions in limine by October 6, 2017. PTO ¶5. Under  
 17 the PTO, motions in limine shall be filed in a single document, not to exceed 25 pages, with each  
 18 motion listed as a subheading. *Id.* Oppositions are due on October 23, 2017; no replies are  
 19 allowed. *Id.*

20 Plaintiffs believe that resolution of motions in limine on several topics will streamline trial  
 21 preparations, shorten the trial, and ultimately lessen the jury's work. Among others, Plaintiffs are  
 22 planning to file motions seeking to exclude purported pro-competitive justifications Defendants  
 23 plan to offer at trial that are either not cognizable under the law or unsupported by any evidence.  
 24 Given the breadth of purported pro-competitive justifications issues Defendants have raised,  
 25 Plaintiffs believe that these motions may, by themselves, require substantial briefing.

26 Accordingly, the parties have conferred and agree, subject to the Court's approval, to  
 27 expand the total page limits for motions in limine and oppositions to 35 pages. Given that extension  
 28 and the compressed time period allowed for briefing, the parties further agree to a modest

1 modification of the briefing schedule, pursuant to which motions in limine would be exchanged on  
2 September 29, 2017 and filed on October 6, 2017, with oppositions of 35 pages due on October 23,  
3 2017.

4 **3. Date for filing the joint final pretrial conference statement**

5 There is some uncertainty concerning the date on which the joint final pretrial conference  
6 statement is to be filed. The PTO provides that the parties should meet and confer at least 21 days  
7 before the November 6, 2017 Pretrial Conference (requiring the meet and confer to take place by  
8 October 16, 2017) and file the joint statement at least 14 days before the Pretrial Conference (by  
9 October 23, 2017). *See* PTO ¶ 1. But the scheduling order amendment issued on December 2, 2016  
10 [ECF 640] calls for the joint statement to be filed on October 16, 2017. The parties agree that the  
11 deadlines set forth in the PTO—requiring the parties to meet and confer by October 16 and file the  
12 joint statement by October 23—are the operative dates.

13 **4. Application of Federal Rule of Evidence 703 at Trial**

14 ***Plaintiffs' Position***

15 Plaintiffs seek the Court's advice about how it wishes the jury to learn of the fact evidence  
16 reasonably relied upon by an expert witness in forming his or her expert opinion. Because most of  
17 the fact witnesses are outside of the subpoena power of the Court due to the MDL transfer, most of  
18 the fact testimony will likely be presented by videotaped deposition designations. Plaintiffs are  
19 choosing their videotaped deposition designations now, so this inquiry is timely. Plaintiffs do not  
20 believe that the facts on which an expert will reasonably rely need be independently admitted into  
21 evidence, which would enlarge the length of the deposition designations, the number of exhibits  
22 introduced through them, and create the need to designate foundational testimony for each such  
23 exhibit. Instead, Plaintiffs believe that FRE 703's language allows disclosure to the jury of the  
24 bases for an expert's opinion, without those facts or data being separately admitted, so long as they  
25 would otherwise be admissible. *See* FRE 703. Plaintiffs believe this is the more efficient, and thus  
26 better, practice, but do not want to guess wrong. The parties seek guidance concerning how such  
27 evidence will be handled at trial.

1                   ***Defendants' Position***

2                   Plaintiffs say “that they do not believe that the facts on which an expert will reasonably rely  
 3 need be independently admitted into evidence,” such that Plaintiffs should be permitted to  
 4 “disclos[e] to the jury the bases for an expert’s opinion, without those facts or data being separately  
 5 admitted, so long as they would otherwise be admissible.” But Rule 703 does not set forth so broad  
 6 and open-ended a rule; it says nothing about an expert publishing evidence to the jury simply  
 7 because that evidence could be properly admitted. *See FED. R. EVID. 703* (“If experts in the  
 8 particular field would reasonably rely on those kinds of facts or data in forming an opinion on the  
 9 subject, they need not be admissible *for the opinion* to be admitted.”) (emphasis added). Rule 703  
 10 thus provides for “the possibility of expert reliance...*without* disclosure of the [evidence] itself to  
 11 the jury.” *United States v. W. R. Grace*, 504 F.3d 745, 765-766 (9th Cir. 2007) (emphasis  
 12 added). Moreover, a jury is best able to evaluate expert opinions after the factual basis has been  
 13 admitted into evidence; expert opinions must have a proper factual backdrop. Reverse payment  
 14 cases are no exception; in this context as in any other, “Trial experts are not the source of primary  
 15 evidence. They merely provide the jury with a potential means for analyzing that evidence.” *In re*  
 16 *Nexium Esomeprazole Antitrust Litig.*, 42 F. Supp. 3d 231, 284 (D. Mass. 2014), *aff’d*, 842 F.3d 34  
 17 (1st Cir. 2016). Plaintiffs cannot seek a blanket ruling as to whether they can publish (unspecified)  
 18 evidence to the jury in all instances. If Plaintiffs (or Defendants) wish to disclose to the jury  
 19 particular evidence on which an expert relies, that is a case-by-case determination for the Court at  
 20 trial. But there is no support at this stage for the relief that Plaintiffs seek.

21                   **III. CASE DEVELOPMENTS**

22                   **1. Expert Discovery.** All expert depositions have been completed.

23                   **2. Case Schedule.** Trial remains scheduled to begin on December 4, 2017.

24                   **3. Rule 56 and Daubert Motions.** On June 30 and July 14, 2017, the parties filed  
 25 motions for summary judgment and to exclude certain experts. All opposition papers are due on  
 26 Monday, August 7, 2017. Replies are due on Friday, August 25, 2017. The hearing on the motions  
 27 is set for Friday, September 15, 2017, at 9:00 a.m.

28                   **4. Sealing of Rule 56 and Daubert Papers.** On June 27, 2017, the Court entered a

1 stipulation allowing the parties to conditionally file all papers relating to motions for summary  
 2 judgment and *Daubert* that contain any information designated under the protective order under  
 3 seal, with formal motions to follow on or before September 6, 2017. [ECF #766]

4 **5. Notice to the End-Payor Class.** In accordance with the schedule set forth in the  
 5 Order Approving Notice Plan and Authorizing Distribution of Notice to the End-Payor Class [ECF  
 6 #751], the End-Payor Plaintiffs represent that KCC—the End-Payor Plaintiffs' notice  
 7 administrator—has activated the notice website and toll-free number, completed the mailing of  
 8 notice to TPP members of the End-Payor Class, commenced internet publication notice, and is  
 9 preparing to complete publication notice in printed media.

10 **IV. OUTSTANDING FACT DISCOVERY**

11 **1. Deposition of Endo's Caroline Manogue.** The parties are meeting and conferring  
 12 concerning the scheduling of this supplementary deposition.

14 Dated: August 4, 2017

15 Respectfully submitted,

16 **For the Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs:**

17 /s/ Peter R. Kohn  
 Peter R. Kohn  
 18 Joseph T. Lukens  
**FARUQI & FARUQI LLP**  
 19 101 Greenwood Avenue, Suite 600  
 Jenkintown, PA 19046  
 20 Telephone: (215) 277-5770  
 Facsimile: (215) 277-5771  
 21 Email: pkohn@faruqilaw.com

22 /s/ David S. Nalven  
 Thomas M. Sobol  
 David S. Nalven  
 24 Gregory T. Arnold  
**HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP**  
 25 55 Cambridge Parkway, Suite 301  
 Cambridge, MA 02142  
 26 Telephone: (617) 482-3700  
 Email: tom@hbsslaw.com  
 Email: davidn@hbsslaw.com  
 27 Email: grega@hbsslaw.com

For the End-Payor Plaintiffs:

/s/ Dena C. Sharp  
 Daniel C. Girard (SBN 114826)  
 Dena C. Sharp (SBN 245869)  
**GIRARD GIBBS LLP**  
 601 California Street, 14th Floor  
 San Francisco, CA 94108  
 Telephone: (415) 981-4800  
 Facsimile: (415) 981-4846  
 Email: dcg@girardgibbs.com  
 Email: chc@girardgibbs.com

/s/ Renae D. Steiner  
 Renae D. Steiner  
**HEINS MILLS & OLSON, P.L.C.**  
 310 Clifton Avenue  
 Minneapolis, MN 55403  
 Telephone: (612) 338-4605  
 Facsimile: (612) 338-4692  
 Email: rsteiner@heinsmills.com

1 /s/ Noah Silverman  
2 Bruce E. Gerstein  
3 Noah Silverman  
4 Ephraim R. Gerstein  
5 **GARWIN GERSTEIN & FISHER LLP**  
6 88 Pine Street, 10th Floor  
7 New York, NY 10005  
8 Telephone: (212) 398-0055  
9 Facsimile: (212) 764-6620  
10 Email: bgerstein@garwingerstein.com  
11 Email: nsilverman@garwingerstein.com  
12 Email: egerstein@garwingerstein.com

13 *Co-Lead Counsel for the Direct Purchaser Class*

14 Joseph R. Saveri  
15 Joshua P. Davis  
16 Andrew M. Purdy  
17 Ryan J. McEwan  
18 **JOSEPH SAVERI LAW FIRM, INC.**  
19 505 Montgomery Street, Suite 625  
20 San Francisco, California 94111  
21 Telephone: (415) 500-6800  
22 Facsimile: (415) 395-9940  
23 Email: jsaveri@saverilawfirm.com  
24 Email: rmcewan@saverilawfirm.com

25 *Liaison Counsel for the End-Payor Class*  
26 Plaintiffs

27 *For the Rite Aid Plaintiffs:*

28 /s/ Barry L. Refsin  
1 Barry L. Refsin  
2 **HANGLEY ARONCHICK SEGAL PUDLIN**  
3 & **SCHILLER**  
4 One Logan Square, 27<sup>th</sup> Floor  
5 Philadelphia, PA 19103  
6 Telephone: (215) 496-7031  
7 Facsimile: (215) 568-0300  
8 brefsin@hangley.com

9 Monica L. Kiley  
10 **HANGLEY ARONCHICK SEGAL PUDLIN**  
11 & **SCHILLER**  
12 4400 Deer Path Road, Suite 200  
13 Harrisburg, PA 17110  
14 Telephone: (717) 364-1007  
15 Facsimile: (717) 234-3982  
16 mkiley@hangley.com

17 *Attorneys for Rite Aid Plaintiffs*

18 /s/ Sharon K. Robertson  
19 Sharon K. Robertson  
20 Donna M. Evans  
21 **COHEN MILSTEIN SELLERS & TOLL**  
22 **PLLC**  
23 88 Pine Street, 14th Floor  
24 New York, New York 10005  
25 Telephone: (212) 838-7797  
26 Facsimile: (212) 838-7745  
27 Email: srobertson@cohenmilstein.com  
28 Email: devans@cohenmilstein.com

29 *Co-Lead Counsel for the End-Payor Class*

30 *For the Walgreen Plaintiffs:*

31 /s/ Anna T. Neill  
32 Anna T. Neill  
33 Scott E. Perwin  
34 Lauren C. Ravkind  
35 **KENNY NACHWALTER P.A.**  
36 1100 Miami Center  
37 201 South Biscayne Boulevard  
38 Miami, FL 33131  
39 Telephone: (305) 373-1000  
40 Facsimile: (305) 372-1861  
41 Email: aneill@knpa.com

42 *Attorneys for Walgreen Plaintiffs*

1 **Attorneys for Plaintiff Government Employees Health Association**

2 /s/ Todd A. Seaver

3 Joseph J. Tabacco, Jr.  
4 Todd A. Seaver  
5 Sarah Khorasanee McGrath  
6 **BERMAN DEVALERIO**  
7 One California Street, Suite 900  
8 San Francisco, CA 94111  
9 Telephone: (415) 433-3200  
10 Facsimile: (415) 433-6382

11 **RAWLINGS & ASSOCIATES PLLC**

12 Mark D. Fisher  
13 Robert Griffith  
14 One Eden Way  
15 LaGrange, KY 40031-8100  
16 Telephone: (502) 587-1279

17 **LOWEY DANNENBERG COHEN & HART,  
18 P.C.**

19 Barbara Hart  
20 Peter D. St. Phillip  
21 Noelle Ruggiero  
22 One North Broadway  
23 White Plains, New York 10601  
24 Telephone: (914) 997-0500  
25 Facsimile: (914) 997-0035

26 **For the Defendants:**

13 /s/ Joseph A. Meckes

14 David S. Elkins (State Bar No. 148077)  
15 **SQUIRE PATTON BOGGS (US) LLP**  
16 620 Hansen Way  
17 Palo Alto, California 94304  
18 Telephone: (650) 856-6500  
19 Facsimile: (650) 843-8777  
20 David.Elkins@squirepb.com

21 **SKADDEN, ARPS, SLATE, MEAGHER  
& FLOM LLP**

22 /s/ Karen Hoffman Lent

23 Karen Hoffman Lent (admitted pro hac vice)  
24 Four Times Square  
25 New York, New York 10036  
26 Telephone: (212) 735-3000  
27 Facsimile: (917) 777-3000  
28 Karen.Lent@skadden.com

29 Steven C. Sunshine (admitted pro hac vice)  
30 Sean M. Tepe (admitted pro hac vice)  
31 1440 New York Ave. NW  
32 Washington DC, 20005  
33 Telephone: (202) 371-7000  
34 Facsimile: (202) 393-5760  
35 Steve.Sunshine@skadden.com  
36 Sean.Tepe@skadden.com

37 Patrick Hammon (State Bar No. 255047)  
38 525 University Avenue, Suite 1100  
39 Palo Alto, CA 94301  
40 Telephone: (650) 470-4500  
41 Facsimile: (650) 470-4570  
42 patrick.hammon@skadden.com

43 **Attorneys for Defendants Teikoku Pharma  
44 USA, Inc. and Teikoku Seiyaku Co., Ltd.**

45 **ARNOLD & PORTER KAYE SCHOLER  
46 LLP**

47 /s/ Daniel B. Asimow

48 Daniel B. Asimow (State Bar No. 165661)  
49 Three Embarcadero Center, 10th Floor  
50 San Francisco, California 94111-4024  
51 Telephone: (415) 471-3100

52 **Attorneys for Defendants Actavis, Inc., Watson  
53 Pharmaceuticals, Inc., Watson Laboratories,  
54 Inc., Actavis plc., Anda Inc., Anda  
55 Pharmaceuticals, Inc., and Valmed  
56 Pharmaceuticals, Inc.**

1 Facsimile: (415) 471-3400  
2 Daniel.Asimow@apks.com

3 Jonathan L. Stern (admitted pro hac vice)  
4 Steven G. Reade (admitted pro hac vice)  
5 Ryan Z. Watts (admitted pro hac vice)  
6 601 Massachusetts Ave., N.W.  
7 Washington, D.C. 20001  
Telephone: (202) 942-5000  
Facsimile: (202) 942-4999  
Jonathan.Stern@apks.com  
Steven.Reade@apks.com  
Ryan.Watts@apks.com

8 Heidi K. Hubbard (admitted pro hac vice)  
9 Stanley E. Fisher (admitted pro hac vice)  
10 Benjamin M. Greenblum (admitted pro hac vice)  
11 Elise M. Baumgarten (admitted pro hac vice)

12 **WILLIAMS & CONNOLLY LLP**

13 725 Twelfth Street, N.W.  
14 Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-5000  
Facsimile: (202) 434-5029  
hubbard@wc.com  
sfisher@wc.com  
bgreenblum@wc.com  
ebaumgarten@wc.com

15 *Attorneys for Defendant Endo Pharmaceuticals  
16 Inc.*

17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

## ATTESTATION STATEMENT

I, Daniel B. Asimow, am the ECF User whose identification and password are being used to file this **Joint Telephonic Status Conference Statement**. Pursuant to Civil L.R. 5-1(i)(3), I attest under penalty of perjury that concurrence in this filing has been obtained from all counsel.

/s/ Daniel B. Asimow  
Daniel B. Asimow